

REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the final Office Action dated March 4, 2008, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 1-8 are pending in the present application. With this Amendment, no claims have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by this Amendment. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

At the outset, the Applicants formally request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney regarding the scheduling of a telephone interview to help expedite prosecution of the present application. The undersigned attorney will also contact the Examiner shortly after filing the response to facilitate the scheduling of the telephone interview. The Applicants respectfully request that a telephone interview be conducted prior to the issuance of a subsequent action on the merits.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4 and 6-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takahashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,887,193, hereafter “Takahashi”). The Applicants traverse this rejection for the reasons noted below.

The Applicants maintain that Takahashi fails to disclose or suggest at least the features recited in independent claims 1 and 8. Specifically, claims 1 and 8 (in relevant part) recite the following features not disclosed or suggested by Takahashi:

“...operation control means, provided in correspondence with each format engine, for pre-defining a correspondence between the common states and individual states which define the operating states of each format engine in a representation different for each format engine, and controlling operations of the format engines such that each format engine is in an arbitrary individual state;

wherein:

when changing a format engine to a pre-defined common state, the format engine managing means sends a message including common state information indicating the pre-defined common state to the operation control means provided in correspondence with the format engine; and

when the message is received from the format engine managing means, the operation

control means controls the format engine such that the format engine is in an individual state corresponding to a common state indicated by the common state information included in the message.”

The features noted above in independent claims 1 and 8 are fully supported by the Applicants’ disclosure (see e.g., pgs. 24-36 and Figs. 4, 5a and 5b).

The present invention, as recited in independent claims 1 and 8, is directed to controlling a format engine based on the use of at least two types of information that includes common state information and individual state information. A format engine can be implemented in, for example, a digital TV and may include a plurality of different individual operating states (e.g., active, non-active, paused, stopped, etc.). Additionally, management of each format engine can be at least initially implemented using a pre-defined common state, which is common to the operation of all format engines. However, under certain circumstances, it is beneficial to control a format engine based on a more specific individual operating state, which may be different from the common operating state.

In order to be able to switch between a common operating state and an individual operation state, the present invention (are recited in claims 1 and 8) includes the use of an operation control means that controls each format engine based on a pre-defined correspondence between the common states and individual states, wherein the individual states define the operating states of each format engine in a representation different for each format engine. Thus, the operation of the format engines can be controlled such that each format engine is in an arbitrary individual state.

In summary, the present application (as recited in claims 1 and 8), uses two kinds of information (i.e., common state information and individual state information) for managing and controlling format engines. As noted above, the common state information is common to all format engines, wherein the individual state information has a format and content that is different for each format engine.

Thus, at least the following features of claims 1 and 8 are not believed to be disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art:

- 1) providing a pre-defined correspondence between the common states and individual states which define the operating states of each format engine in a representation different for each format engine, and controlling operations of the format engines such that each format engine is in an arbitrary individual state; and
- 2) controlling a format engine in an individual state corresponding to a common state included in a message received from a format engine managing means for controlling the format engine.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relied on Takahashi for disclosing or suggesting all the features recited in independent claims 1 and 8 (e.g., abstract, Col. 1, line 50 – Col. 2, line 19; Col. 9, line 36 – Col. 10, line 22; Col. 19, line 43 – Col. 20, line 23).

However, the abstract of Takahashi discloses a control system that includes a controller arranged to be connected to an arbitrary number of peripheral devices selected from among a plurality of peripheral devices. The controller is implemented to read control information stored in the peripheral devices via a common communication line, and store the control information in a memory area in a predetermined format. The control information is then used to control the peripheral devices.

The features noted above in the abstract of Takahashi are also similarly described in Col. 1, line 50 – Col. 2, line 19 of Takahashi. Briefly, Col. 1, line 50 – Col. 2, line 19 of Takahashi describes a controller connected to a plurality of peripheral devices via a common communication line for unilaterally controlling the peripheral devices. Similar to the abstract of Takahashi, Col. 1, line 50 – Col. 2, line 19 describes the use of control information stored in the peripheral devices that is read and stored in a controller in a predetermined format for controlling the peripheral devices.

As noted above, both the abstract and Col. 1, line 50 – Col. 2, line 19 of Takahashi fail to disclose or suggest predefining a correspondence between common states and individual states which define the outputting of each format engine in a representation different for each format engine, and controlling the operation format in such that each engine is in an arbitrary individual state. To the contrary, the above sections of Takahashi merely disclose the storing of common

state information in a predetermined format that is used for general control of the peripheral devices.

Takahashi at Col. 9, line 43 – Col. 20, line 23 (in relevant part) discloses controlling the on and off state of a multimedia device using a multimedia controller. However, again, nothing in this section of Takahashi describes the use of a predefined correspondence between the common states and individual states which define the operating states of each format engine in the representation different from each format engine; and controlling the operation of the format in such that each format engine is an arbitrary individual state.

Finally, Col. 9, line 36 – Col. 10, line 22 of Takahashi disclose a multimedia device that includes a software object which is a resident multimedia controller for performing management of the entire multimedia device. As described in Takahashi, a state in which the multimedia device (controlled side) has not yet been connected to the multimedia controller (controlling site), and a state in which the multimedia device has been connected to the multimedia controller are described.

However, similarly, nothing in Col. 9, line 36 – Col. 10, line 22 of Takahashi discloses or suggests the use of common state information and individual state information in the management and control of a format engine, let alone providing a pre-defined correspondence between the common state information and individual state information.

Based on the above discussion, Takahashi fails to disclose or suggest at least the following features recited in claims 1 and 8:

- 1) proving a predefined correspondence between the common states and individual states which define the operating states of each format engine and a representation different from each format engine, and controlling operations of the format engine such that each format engine is in an arbitrary individual state; and
- 2) controlling a format engine in an individual state corresponding to a common state including a message received from a format engine managing means for controlling the format engine.

Based on the foregoing, independent claims 1 and 8 are not anticipated or rendered

obvious by Takahashi. Additionally, dependent claims 2-4, 6, and 7 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Takahashi based at least on their dependency from independent claim 1.

In the Office Action, claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi. Claim 5 depends from independent claim 1. As noted above, Takahashi fails to disclose or suggest all the features of claim 1. Accordingly, no modification of or combination with Takahashi would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claim 5 by virtue of its dependency from independent claim 1.

Based on the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the Office Action dated March 4, 2008, and pass this application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Yuki HORII et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/

By: _____
2008.06.04 16:37:02 -04'00'

Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45,794
Attorney for Applicant

MDP/ats
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
June 4, 2008